



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/732,292 12/08/00 ANAI

I 820.32596CX5

020457 TM02/1002
ANTONELLI TERRY STOUT AND KRAUS
SUITE 1800
1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET
ARLINGTON VA 22209

EXAMINER

PHAN, R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2181

DATE MAILED:

10/02/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/732,292

Applicant(s)

Aral et al.

Examiner

Raymond N. Phan

Group Art Unit

2181



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Dec 8, 2000

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☒ Claim(s) 24-29 is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-23, 30, 31, and 33 is/are rejected.

☒ Claim(s) 32 is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 2

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Part III DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant(s)

1. This action is responsive to the following communications: continuation filed on December 8, 2000.
2. This application has been examined. Claims 1-33 are pending.
3. The Group and/or Art Unit location of your application in the PTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Group Art Unit 2181.

Double Patenting

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321© may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

5. Claims 24 and 27 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 in Patent No. ✓6,247,090. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the omissions of, at least a portion of the display unit information, in claim 1 are obvious expedients since elements of claims 24 and 27 of the present application still perform the same functions, means for receiving

video signals for video display from the video source; memory means for storing at least display unit information; communication controller capable of bi-directionally communicating with the video source, as claim 1 of the patent. In re Karlson, 136 USPQ 189 (ccPA 1963).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-23, 30-31, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawdon (US No. 5,276,458) view of Monnes (US No. 5,375,210)

In regards to claims 1, 10, 12, 16, 18, 20, 21, 22, 30, Sawdon a display system comprising a communication circuit 97 for communicating with an externally connected computer (see figure 1, col. 2, lines 57-67) wherein the communication circuit is having memory 11 contains identification code for the display system (see col. 3, lines 45-60). But Sawdon do not disclose the communication control circuit comprising a comparing means for comparing a first identification information which is previously stored in the display unit and the second identification information which is previously stored in the computer and is sent from computer; and a communication permission means for permitting communication between the computer with respect to the display control of the display unit, when the first and second identification information match as a result of the comparison by the comparing means. However Monnes et al. disclose the communication control circuit comprising a comparing means for comparing a first identification

information which is previously stored in the display unit and the second identification information which is previously stored in the computer and is sent from computer; and a communication permission means for permitting communication between the computer with respect to the display control of the display unit, when the first and second identification information match as a result of the comparison by the comparing means (see col. 4, lines 14-61). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Monnes et al. within the system of Sawdon because it would provide extended support of additional monitor types which could integrated easily into existing system.

In regards to claims 2, 8, and 14, Sawdon teach first identification stored in the memory 9 (see col. 3, lines 7-19).

In regard to claims 3, 9, 12, 15, 33, Sawdon et al. teach the first and second identification information including identification number (i.e. code) (see abstract)

In regards to claim 4, in addition to claim 1, Sawdon disclose the reception permission means for permitting reception of the control command for controlling at least a display size/position of the display unit from the computer (see col. 9, lines 6-37).

In regards to claim 5, Sawdon further disclose the control command including information for controlling a display brightness/contrast (see col. 1, lines 5-15).

In regards to claims 6-7, Sawdon further disclose the control command is generated within the computer, based upon a command inputted from an input means (i.e keyboard) connected to the computer (see col. 1, lines 1-15).

In regard to claims 11, 14, 18 and 20, Sawdon discloses the information is transmitted between the computer and display system via serial link (see figure 1, col. 3, lines 6-16).

In regard to claims 17, 22 and 24, Monnes et al. teach the identification number is recognize by the computer at start up (see col. 4, lines 28-41).

In regard to claims 23, 31, Sawdon further discloses the video source is a computer (see figure 1).

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 24-29 are allowable over the prior of records.
9. Claim 32 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

10. Claims 1-23, 30-31, and 33 are rejected. Claims 24-29 are allowed. Claims 32 are objected.
11. The prior arts made of record and not relied upon are considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Howard et al. (US No. 5,257,350) disclose a computer with self configuring video circuitry.

Nicols (US No. 4,991,023) discloses a microprocessor controlled universal video monitor.

Thoma, III (US No. 5,038,301) discloses a method and apparatus for multi-monitor adaptation circuit

Kanno (US No. 5,602,567) discloses a display monitor.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Raymond Phan, whose telephone number is (703) 306-2756. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:30AM- 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, *Ayaz Sheikh*, can be reached on (703) 305-9648 or via e-mail addressed to [*ayza.sheikh@uspto.gov*]. The fax number for this Group is (703) 308-5358.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [*raymond.phan@uspto.gov*].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

RP

Raymond Phan
Sep 27, 2001


ROBERT BEAUSOLEIL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100